

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 9, 11 and 27 under section 102 citing United States Patent No. 6,973,448 to Monberg. Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under section 103 based upon Monberg in combination with United States Patent No. 5,559,707 to DeLorme et al. Claims 14 and 25 were rejected under Section 103 based upon Monberg in combination with United States Patent No. 6,823,260 to Turcotte. Claim 24 was rejected under Section 103 based upon Monberg in combination with United States Patent No. 6,571,279 to Herz et al. Claim 26 was rejected under Section 103 based upon Monberg in combination with Turcotte and United States Patent No. 6,862,594 to Saulpaugh et al.

By this amendment applicant has cancelled claims 9, 11 and 14. Claims 7 and 25 have been amended to limit the method to selecting a telephone number corresponding to a known location. The Examiner concedes at pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action that Monberg does not teach a method in which a telephone number is received as an input. Accordingly, claim 7 as amended, and claims 12, 13 and 25 through 27 which depend from claim 7, are patentable over Monberg.

Claim 24 has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 26 was amended to correct an antecedent basis problem.

DeLorme discloses a computer aided routing system in which information can be provided about points of interest along the way. "The user's choice of a particular location prompts a multimedia presentation of information related to the selected place." See col. 10, lines 49-50. The system enables the user to enter information about points of

interest (POIs). At col. 16, lines 10-13, the patent says, "The system 200 is further able to locate individual POIs for input by enabling a user to select from lists of place names or through linked phone exchange, zip codes or geographic coordinate data. The user can engage in manual input of individual POIs by clicking at points, symbols or place names on the map display." Essentially, DeLorme provides a look-up table which enables a user to find information in that table about a particular selected location using any of the categories of information contained in the table. Then the user can enter that information on the map display. For example, if the user knows the place name, he or she could look up the telephone number for that place and include the telephone number with the place name on the map display. DeLorme does not mention telephone number as an input for starting a search of points of interest near the location of a starting point. Rather, DeLorme only teaches that one can find information about a single point of interest if one has the telephone number associated with that point of interest.

The Examiner asserts that although Monberg does not disclose the use of a telephone number as an input for searching points of interest, one skilled in the art would be led by DeLorme to modify the teachings of Monberg to use telephone number as an input. Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, DeLorme does not utilize telephone numbers for identifying places of interest. Rather DeLorme teaches only that a telephone number can be used to find more information about a point of interest that has been identified and is associated with that telephone number. Second, DeLorme is not concerned with searching for several points of interest that are near a known location. Rather, DeLorme is concerned with placing selected points of interest on a route map.

One skilled in the art looking to design a method for acquiring information about several locations near a known location is not likely to consider a computer aided routing system which plots a path between two points. Therefore, DeLorme is non-analogous art which cannot properly be combined with Monberg. Accordingly the claims as amended are patentable over the combination of Monberg and DeLorme.

Claim 24 was rejected under section 103 based upon the combination of Monberg with Herz. Claim 24 requires the step of providing advertisements based on the known location while displaying selected locations. Herz discloses a method of displaying information based upon a user profile and the physical location of the user. The teaching is that the information is selected based upon the user profile and the physical location of the user. This physical location can be determined in a variety of ways including sensors on or adjacent the user, locations of cell phone towers used by the user's cell phone and location of the internet service provider being used by the user. There is no disclosure of searching for points of interest or displaying information based upon a search for points of interest. Claim 24 requires the provisions of advertisements based upon a known location selected by the user, which may or may not correspond to the physical location of the user. The Examiner asserts at page 11 of the office action that one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify the search disclosed by Monberg to include advertising because Herz says in column 1, lines 24-25 "that information purveyors desire to more efficiently target information to consumers." However, such a desire standing alone would not motive advertisers to consider including advertisements in a search method and selecting those advertisements based upon a known location selected by the user

which may or may not correspond to the physical location of the user. Therefore, claim 24 is patentable over the combination of Monberg with Herz.

The Examiner also cited Monberg in combination with Turcotte and Saulpaugh to reject claim 26 which depends from claims 25 and 7. This claim adds the step of providing advertisements which are selected based upon the nature and location of the search irrespective of the current location of a mobile device. The examiner recognized that neither Monberg nor Turcotte teach the display of advertisements selected based upon the nature and location of the search. Saulpaugh discloses a method of searching advertisements to find advertisements that match a search criteria and then displaying the advertisements that are found. The search is analogous to searching for points of interest and then displaying information about the points of interest that are found. Both display information based upon the results of the search. Claim 26 however does more than search for points of interest and provide information about the points of interest found during the search. The claim also requires the provision of advertisements that are selected based upon the nature and location of the search rather than the results of the search. This is not taught by any of the cited references. Accordingly, claim 26 is patentable.

The claims have been amended to either limit them to features which the Examiner admits are not present in the primary reference or to place the claims in better form. This amendment does not raise any issue that would require further searching by the Examiner.

Application Serial No. 10/708,494
Amendment dated December 11, 2007
Responding to Office Action of September 27, 2007

Entry of the amendment, reconsideration and allowance of the claims as amended
are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lynn J. Alstadt", written over the printed name.

Lynn J. Alstadt
Registration No. 29,362
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219
Attorneys for Applicant

(412) 562-1632